

S.N. 10/632,277

124853

Date of Response: January 30, 2006

Date of Office Communication: November 23, 2005

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the consideration shown by the Patent Office, as evidenced by the November 23, 2005 Office Action. In that Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-37.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the Examiner interview on January 17, 2006. During the interview and as indicated in the 1/20/2006 interview summary, an amendment adding the limitation of a 2-dimensional array would overcome the present rejections of Kingsley (U.S. Patent 5,179,284) in view of Akai (U.S. Patent 5,378,894).

After careful consideration of the November 23, 2005 Office Action, Claims 1, 20, 27, and 34 have been amended. As such, Claims 1-37 remain in the case with none of the Claims being allowed.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application by the Examiner in light of the above amendments and the following remarks offered in response to the November 23, 2005, Office Action.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**Kingsley in view of Akai**

Claims 1, 4-5, and 9-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kingsley (U.S. Patent 5,179,284) in view of Akai (U.S. Patent 5,378,894).

However, the Office Action even admitted that "Kingsley et al. also do not disclose that the reflective layer is provided on the sidewalls of the scintillator elements. Instead, Kingsley et al. only provide for the reflective/protective layers on the top surface of the scintillator, as illustrated in Figure 1." (Page 3.) Furthermore, the Office Action also admitted that "Kingsley et al. are further silent with regards to the claimed thickness and material of the smoothening layer. Kingsley et al. provide for a smoothening layer in the form

S.N. 10/632,277

124853

Date of Response: January 30, 2006

Date of Office Communication: November 23, 2005

of pellicle layer 40, which is a 200-600 Angstroms thick layer of nitrocellulose, poly(para-xylene), organopolysiloxanepolycarbonate, or kryolite." (Page 4.)

Kingsley in view of Akai fails to disclose the location of the reflective material, composition of the reflective layer material, and 2-dimensional array of scintillator elements.

Regarding location of the reflective material, Kinsley only provides a reflective material on the top surface of the scintillator, while Akai provides reflective materials only on sidewalls.

Regarding composition of the reflective layer material, Akai only discloses a blocking material of metallic thin film and at least two polymer sheets and fails to disclose a reflective material comprising a smoothening layer.

Regarding the 2-dimensional array of scintillator elements, Akai only discloses scintillator elements comprising a reflective material in 1-dimension; and 2-dimension is not obvious over Kingsley in view of Akai because it is inoperable to coat the side and hence no likelihood of success. The layers in between the gaps of the 2-dimensional scintillator elements are small and parallel to the side; hence, Akai is inoperable and fails to disclose 2-dimensional scintillator elements coated on the side and top with a reflective layer material having a smoothing layer.

Thus, it would not have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the Kingsley et al. in view of Akai.

Kingsley in view of Akai and further in view of Yoshida

S.N. 10/632,277

124853

Date of Response: January 30, 2006

Date of Office Communication: November 23, 2005

Claims 2-3, 6-8, and 21-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kingsley et al. and Akai, as applied to Claims 1, 5, and 20 above, and further in view of Yoshida (US Patent Application Publication #2002/0196628).

Kingsley in view of Akai fails to disclose the location of the reflective material, composition of the reflective layer material, and 2-dimensional array as discussed above. Yoshida fails to disclose the missing elements. Thus, it would have not have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the combination of Kingsley et al. and Akai in further view of as Yoshida et al.

Kingsley in view of Akai and Bahls

Claims 27-28, 31-32, and 34-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kingsley et al. (US Patent # 5,179,294), in view of Akai (US Patent #5,378,894) and Bahls (US Patent # 3,983,266).

Kingsley in view of Akai fails to disclose the location of the reflective material, composition of the reflective layer material, and 2-dimensional array as discussed above. Bahls fails to disclose the missing elements. Thus, it would have not have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the combination of Kingsley et al., Akai and Bahls.

Kingsley, Akai, and Bahls, and further in view of Krulik

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kingsley et al., Akai, and Bahls, as applied to Claim 27 above, and further in view of Krulik (US Patent # 5,232,492).

Kingsley in view of Akai fails to disclose the location of the reflective material, composition of the reflective layer material, and 2-dimensional array as discussed above. Bahls and Krulik fail to disclose the missing elements. Thus, it would have not have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the combination of Kingsley et al., Akai, Bahls and Krulik. Thus, it would not have been obvious for a person having

S.N. 10/632,277

124853

Date of Response: January 30, 2006

Date of Office Communication: November 23, 2005

ordinary skill in the art to modify the combination of Kingsley et al., Akai, Bahls and Krulik.

Kingsley, Akai, and Bahls, and further in view of Kozlov

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kingsley et al., Akai, and Bahls, as applied to Claim 27 above, and further in view of Kozlov et al. (US Patent # 6,455,175).

Kingsley in view of Akai fails to disclose the location of the reflective material, composition of the reflective layer material, and 2-dimensional array as discussed above. Bahls and Kozlov fail to disclose the missing elements. Thus, it would have not have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the combination of Kingsley et al., Akai, Bahls and Kozlov.

Kingsley, Akai, and Bahls, and further in view of Ferrell

Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kingsley et al., Akai, and Bahls, as applied to Claim 27 above, and further in view of Ferrell (US Patent #6,180,524).

Kingsley in view of Akai fails to disclose the location of the reflective material, composition of the reflective layer material, and 2-dimensional array as discussed above. Bahls and Ferrell fail to disclose the missing elements. Thus, it would have not have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the combination of Kingsley et al., Akai, Bahls and Ferrell.

In light of the amendment and remarks presented herein, Applicant submits that the case is in condition for immediate allowance and respectfully requests such action. If, however, any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the Applicants' counsel at the number provided below.

S.N. 10/632,277

124853

Date of Response: January 30, 2006

Date of Office Communication: November 23, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Tanzina S. Chowdhury
Attorney for the Applicants
Registration No. 46,624

General Electric Company
Building K1, Room 3A63
Niskayuna, New York 12309
Jan 30, 2006
Telephone: (518) 387-7166 or
(518) 387-7122